

### Order Paper Questions

2. How many of the applications were approved and what were the aggregate amounts so approved in each of the three years?

3. What was the actual amount dispersed in each year including the amount dispersed to date in the current year?

4. Were there applicants approved in the current year who were also successful applicants in one or more of the previous years and, if so, how many were there and what were the aggregate amounts involved in each of the years?

5. How many jobs were created in the constituency in each of the years through implementation of LIP projects?

**Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** 1. For 1972-73, 33 applications were received for a value of \$1,581,805. For 1971-72 similar information was not computerized and therefore is not available to provide an accurate answer to this question.

2. 1971-72, two applications for \$58,257; 1972-73, 13 applications for \$351,391.

3. 1971-72, \$58,257; 1972-73, \$255,827 as of June 15, 1973.

4. Yes, two for \$58,257 in 1971-72 and for \$32,191 in 1972-73.

5. 1971-72, 119 man-months; 1972-73, 721 man-months as of June 15, 1973.

### ALLEGED OFFENCES COMMITTED BY DIPLOMATIC PERSONNEL IN CANADA IN EACH OF THE YEARS 1967 TO 1973

#### Question No. 2,004—Mr. Stevens:

1. How many summonses, tickets or other evidences of alleged offences have been turned over to the Protocol Division of the Department of External Affairs or other governmental departments with respect to alleged offences committed by diplomatic personnel in Canada in each of the years 1967 to 1973?

2. How many of the offences were prosecuted in each of the years?

3. How many of the alleged offences resulted in convictions or the payment of a fine or penalty in each of the years?

4. What was the aggregate amount of fines or penalties in each year forgiven, waived or absorbed by the Government of Canada or other governmental bodies?

5. Who were the ten leading countries in numbers of alleged offences and in amounts so forgiven, waived or absorbed in each of the years?

**Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** 1967, 1,034; 1968, 1,115; 1969, 1,016; 1970, 777; 1971, 755; 1972, 803; 1973-May 31, 710<sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> The number of traffic violations notified to the Department of External Affairs increased considerably from April of this year when the Ottawa Police Force instituted new measures in their efforts to control illegal parking.

2. There were no prosecutions as a result of the alleged offences numbered above. Diplomatic personnel resident in, or accredited to Canada, are granted immunity in respect of such offences in accordance with article 31-1 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations which was ratified by Canada in 1966.

3. There were no convictions as a result of the alleged offences listed in answer to question number one. It is however the policy of some embassies to advise their staff members to pay parking tickets. The following figures

[Mr. Stevens.]

represent by year the number of parking offences for which fines were paid voluntarily by diplomatic personnel in Canada: 1967, 195; 1968, 235; 1969, figures not available; 1970, 10; 1971, 47; 1972, 67; 1973-May 31, 33.

4. The aggregate amount is not available. In most cases the Department of External Affairs is notified only that an infraction was committed.

5. It is considered a matter of diplomatic courtesy not to make public the number of alleged offences committed by members of individual embassies. The Department of External Affairs notifies missions in writing of any offences other than parking infractions, allegedly committed by their staff members, and requests the mission concerned in each case to impress upon the alleged offender the gravity of the offences. Missions concerned are also informed of any serious or frequent abuse of parking regulations by their staff members.

### PHENOXY HERBICIDES

#### Question No. 2,049—Mr. Rose:

1. What specific Phenoxy herbicides are authorized for use in Canada by the Department of Agriculture?

2. What specific Phenoxy herbicides did Canada, in the UN, along with 58 other countries, ask to be banned in Viet Nam as biological warfare agents?

3. If the replies to Part 1 and Part 2 include identical chemical preparations, how does the government reconcile the contradiction of authorizing a chemical for use at home while being critical of its use in a foreign land?

**Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** I am informed by the Departments of Agriculture and External Affairs as follows: 1. The following are registered under the Pest Control Products Act for the control of herbaceous weeds and woody plants in some crops and non-crop situations: 2,4-D, 2,4-dichlorophenoxy acetic acid; 2,4,5-T, 2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy acetic acid; 2,4,5-Tp, 2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy propionic acid; 2,4-DB, 2 (2,4-dichlorophenoxy) butyric acid; MCPA, 2 methyl, 4-chlorophenoxy acetic acid; MCPP, 2 (2 methyl, 4-chlorophenoxy) propionic acid; 2,4-Dp, 2 (2,4-dichlorophenoxy) propionic acid; MCPB, 4 (2-methyl, 4-chlorophenoxy) butyric acid.

2. None. In so far as the Department of External Affairs is concerned Resolution 2603A adopted by the 24th Session of the UN General Assembly on December 16, 1969, declared as contrary to the generally recognized rules of international law, as embodied in the Protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating poisonous or other gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare, signed at Geneva on June 17, 1925, the use in international armed conflict of any chemical and biological agents of warfare. The resolution did not specify phenoxy herbicides. Canada abstained in voting on this resolution on the grounds that the interpretation of an international legal instrument should only be made by parties to that instrument, not by the UN General Assembly. The effect of the resolution would have been to nullify the reservations made by countries, which had ratified or acceded to the Protocol; in the Canadian view, changes to these reservations would have to be made by the parties to the Protocol.

3. Not applicable.